



County of San Diego

MARK WARDLAW
DIRECTOR
PHONE (858) 694-2962
FAX (858) 694-2555

PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
5510 OVERLAND AVENUE, SUITE 310, SAN DIEGO, CA 92123
www.sdcounty.ca.gov/pds

March 30, 2017

Environmental Review Update Checklist Form For projects with Previously Approved Environmental Documents

FOR PURPOSES OF CONSIDERATION OF PDS2014-MUP-95-007W¹

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Sections 15162 through 15164 set forth the criteria for determining the appropriate additional environmental documentation, if any, to be completed when there is a previously adopted Negative Declaration (ND) or a previously certified environmental impact report (EIR) covering the project for which a subsequent discretionary action is required. This Environmental Review Update Checklist Form has been prepared in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15164(e) to explain the rationale for determining whether any additional environmental documentation is needed for the subject discretionary action.

1. Background on the previously adopted MND:

An MND for Ramona Baptist Church Major Use Permit, PDS1995-3300-95-007 was adopted by the Planning and Environmental Review Board (PERB) on January 16, 1997. The adopted MND found the project would have potentially significant effects to traffic, which were clearly mitigated. These potentially significant effects that were clearly mitigated consisted of the following: executed a secured agreement to improve and construct a left-turn lane north bound on SR-78 for traffic movements into Ash Street by lengthening the turn lane, execute a lien agreement to share in the construction cost to improve the vertical curve sight distance on SR-78 southerly of Ash Street, and Landscape Plans which include water conservation.

2. Lead agency name and address:

County of San Diego, Planning & Development Services
5510 Overland Avenue, Suite 110
San Diego, CA 92123

- a. Contact Marisa Smith, Project Manager
- b. Phone number: (858) 694-2621
- c. E-mail: marisa.smith@sdcounty.ca.gov

3. Project applicant's name and address:

Hedy Levine, REC Consultants, Inc., 2442 Second Ave, San Diego, CA 92101

4. Summary of the activities authorized by present permit/entitlement application(s):

The applicant requests a Major Use Permit (MUP) Modification of MUP95-007 to expand the existing church site in four separate phases of development. The site currently includes a 16,767 square foot fellowship hall and 9,924 square foot education building, along with 150 parking spaces. Septic fields exist on site.

Phase 1 of the Modification would consist of constructing a 1,697 square foot lobby with a bridge on the roof to connect the existing fellowship hall and education building (Building A). This proposal was included in the original MUP. The applicant would be removing the original MUP proposal for a monument sign and baseball field during this phase.

Phase 2 would involve the construction of a two-story, 9,924 square foot education building (Building C) to the northeast of the existing fellowship hall. Parking will be reconfigured to accommodate the new building, and the total parking count at this stage would be 173. A bio-retention basin would be added within the island area of the parking lot, north of the Educational Building. In addition, play structures would be temporarily relocated within the site during construction.

Phase 3 consists of the construction of a two-story 35,512 square foot sanctuary building to the south of the existing education building. The parking during Phase 3 would increase to 409 spaces. This phase would also add a 24-foot wide fire lane connecting the northern most entrance to the southern entrance. A driveway to the south along Meadowlark Way would be added and would include monument signage for the church. A large detention basin would be constructed along the southern portion of the project site and a smaller basin would be constructed in the northeastern corner of the property adjacent to an advanced wastewater treatment system. A large flat pad would be included in this phase which would accommodate development in Phase 4.

Phase 4 would conclude with the construction of a final two-story 9,924 square foot educational building (Building B). A final bio-retention basin would be added adjacent to Building B. The final parking count after Phase 4 is complete would be 459.

5. Does the project for which a subsequent discretionary action is now proposed differ in any way from the previously approved project?

YES

☒

NO

☐

If yes, describe **ALL** differences.

Aesthetics, Biology, Transportation/Traffic

6. SUBJECT AREAS DETERMINED TO HAVE NEW OR SUBSTANTIALLY MORE SEVERE SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS COMPARED TO THOSE IDENTIFIED IN THE PREVIOUS ND OR EIR. The subject areas checked below were determined to be new significant environmental effects or to be previously identified effects that have a substantial increase in severity either due to a change in project, change in circumstances or new information of substantial importance, as indicated by the checklist and discussion on the following pages.

- | | | |
|--|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> NONE | | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture and Forest Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Geology & Soils |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Haz Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology & Water Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use & Planning | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Population & Housing | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities & Service Systems | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |

DETERMINATION:

On the basis of this analysis, Planning & Development Services has determined that:

- ☐ No substantial changes are proposed in the project and there are no substantial changes in the circumstances under which the project will be undertaken that will require major revisions to the previous EIR or ND due to the involvement of significant new environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects. Also, there is no "new information of substantial importance" as that term is used in CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a)(3). Therefore, the previously adopted ND or previously certified EIR is adequate without modification OR upon completion of an ADDENDUM.
- ☐ No substantial changes are proposed in the project and there are no substantial changes in the circumstances under which the project will be undertaken that will require major revisions to the previous EIR or ND due to the involvement of significant new environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects. Also, there is no "new information of substantial importance" as that term is used in CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a)(3). Therefore, because the project is a residential project in conformance with, and pursuant to, a Specific Plan with a EIR completed after January 1, 1980, the project is exempt pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15182.
- ☒ Substantial changes are proposed in the project or there are substantial changes in the circumstances under which the project will be undertaken that will require major revisions to the previous ND due to the involvement of significant new environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects. Or, there is "new information of substantial importance," as that term is used in CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a)(3). However all new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in severity of previously identified significant effects are clearly avoidable through the incorporation of mitigation measures agreed to by the project applicant. Therefore, a SUBSEQUENT ND is required.
- ☐ Substantial changes are proposed in the project or there are substantial changes in the circumstances under which the project will be undertaken that will require major revisions to the previous ND or EIR due to the involvement of significant new environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects. Or, there is "new information of substantial importance," as that term is used in CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a)(3). Therefore, a SUBSEQUENT or SUPPLEMENTAL EIR is required.

Signature

Marisa Smith
Printed Name

March 30, 2017

Date

Project Manager
Title

INTRODUCTION

CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162 through 15164 set forth the criteria for determining the appropriate additional environmental documentation, if any, to be completed when there is a previously adopted ND or a previously certified EIR for the project.

CEQA Guidelines, Section 15162(a) and 15163 state that when an ND has been adopted or an EIR certified for a project, no Subsequent or Supplemental EIR or Subsequent Negative Declaration shall be prepared for that project unless the lead agency determines, on the basis of substantial evidence in light of the whole public record, one or more of the following:

1. Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or Negative Declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.
2. Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or Negative Declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.
3. New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete or the Negative Declaration was adopted, shows any of the following:
 - a. The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR or Negative Declaration; or
 - b. Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previously adopted Negative Declaration or previously certified EIR; or
 - c. Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or
 - d. Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous Negative Declaration or EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

CEQA Guidelines, Section 15164(a) states that an Addendum to a previously certified EIR may be prepared if some changes or additions are necessary but none of the conditions described in Section 15162 calling for preparation of a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR have occurred.

CEQA Guidelines, Section 15164(b) states that an Addendum to a previously adopted Negative Declaration may be prepared if only minor technical changes or additions are necessary.

If the factors listed in CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162, 15163, or 15164 have not occurred or are not met, no changes to the previously certified EIR or previously adopted ND are necessary.

The following responses detail any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or "new information of substantial importance" that may cause one or more effects to environmental resources. The responses support the "Determination," above, as to the type of environmental documentation required, if any.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW UPDATE CHECKLIST

I. AESTHETICS – Since the previous ND was adopted, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or "new information of substantial importance" that cause one or more effects to aesthetic resources including: scenic vistas; scenic resources including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, or historic buildings within a state scenic highway; existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings; or day or nighttime views in the area?

YES
☐

NO
☒

The project would not within a scenic vista, would not visually impact a scenic resource. However, the project is located adjacent to State Route 78, which is identified as a County Scenic Highway in the County of San Diego General Plan. In addition, the project was evaluated for impacts to the visual character and quality of the site and surroundings, as well as day and nighttime views.

The existing church would be developed in four separate phases, in which the church buildings would essentially double in cumulative square footage, from 26,691 square feet to 55,360 square feet. All buildings (existing and proposed) would have two stories. The existing education building is 32-feet, six-inches in height and a footprint of 5,124 square feet. The two new education buildings (Buildings "B" and "C") would be the same footprint, design, and height as the existing education building. The existing fellowship hall has a height of 35-feet and a footprint of 11,940 square feet, and would remain unchanged. The proposed sanctuary building would have a footprint of 28,162 square feet in size and an undulating roof layout, which would vary in height from 34-feet to 36-feet 1 ¼-inch. It should be noted that the original Major Use Permit included the existing fellowship hall, two education buildings, and a softball field. The increase in structures would change from three buildings (fellowship hall and two education buildings) to five buildings (fellowship hall, three education buildings and a sanctuary). The softball field would be replaced with a new parking lot. An elevation layout of all buildings after the final phase is found on page 7.1 of the plot plan.

Visual Character and Quality - While the combined square footage of the buildings will double in size, the applicant has proposed design features to help limit the visual impact. For example, landscaping would be added along Ash Street and State Route 78, which would help to buffer and screen the church and new parking area. Also, the buildings would be painted earth tone colors, which were approved by the Ramona Design Review Board on November 20, 2014, and the

Community Planning Group on December 15, 2014. Finally, the buildings would be separated no less than 30 feet from each other, as opposed to a single mass building. These breaks between the buildings allow a passing viewer to “see through” the gaps in the buildings and to the land in the background, which provides intermittent breaks in design for the viewer.

County Scenic Highway - Also, the proposed additions would be located a minimum of 80 feet from State Route 78. This increased distance allows the buildings to appear smaller from the vantage point of motorists and pedestrians travelling along State Route 78. Therefore, for the traveler along State Route 78, the view would be temporary and change as the viewer moved through the viewshed. Open space separates the project from the roadway. At times this view may be shielded by vegetation or other impediments to the line of sight such as existing buildings. Their exposure would be considered moderate.

Day and Nighttime Views – As previously discussed in the “Visual Character and Quality” above, the applicant has proposed mitigation measures such as landscaping, muted paint colors, increased setbacks and layout of the structures, to help minimize visual impacts. For the nighttime views, the applicant has submitted and obtained approval of a Photometric Study. The plans indicate how the greatest concentration of lights would be on and around the sanctuary building and existing fellowship hall. Each parking lot light would be attached to a 20-foot high pole. The majority of the parking lot lighting would be within the southern parking area. As with all projects, the plans would be required to conform to the Lighting Ordinance, which requires design features (low lumens, shielding of lights) to help minimize spilling of light into the night sky or adjacent properties. In addition, the project’s outdoor lighting is controlled through the Major Use Permit, which further limits outdoor lighting through strict controls. Therefore, compliance with the Code, in combination with the outdoor lighting and glare controls listed above ensures that the project will not create a significant new source of substantial light or glare.

Therefore, with the design features provided, the Modification to the Major Use Permit will not result in any adverse project or cumulative level effect to aesthetic resources.

II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES -- Since the previous EIR was certified or previous ND was adopted, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or "new information of substantial importance" that cause one or more effects to agriculture or forestry resources including: conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to a non-agricultural use, conflicts with existing zoning for agricultural use or Williamson Act contract, or conversion of forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?

YES
☐

NO
☒

III. AIR QUALITY -- Since the previous EIR was certified or previous ND was adopted, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or "new information of substantial importance" that cause one or more effects to air quality including: conflicts with or obstruction of implementation of the San Diego Regional Air Quality

Strategy (RAQS) or applicable portions of the State Implementation Plan (SIP); violation of any air quality standard or substantial contribution to an existing or projected air quality violation; a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard; exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations; or creation of objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

YES

☐

NO

☒

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES -- Since the previous EIR was certified or previous ND was adopted, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or "new information of substantial importance" that cause one or more effects to biological resources including: adverse effects on any sensitive natural community (including riparian habitat) or species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in a local or regional plan, policy, or regulation, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; adverse effects to federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act; interference with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with wildlife corridors, or impeding the use of native wildlife nursery sites; and/or conflicts with the provisions of any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Communities Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan, policies or ordinances?

YES

☒

NO

☐

Based on a Biological Resources Letter Report dated July 17, 2015 prepared by REC Consultants, it has been determined that the project site is partially developed and supports non-native grassland, disturbed land, and developed land. In order to mitigate for the impacts to non-native grassland, the applicant shall either purchase mitigation habitat credit or provide for the conservation of habitat of 0.3 acre of non-native grassland. If purchasing the conservation habitat, the purchase must be within a County-approved mitigation bank in the North County, as detailed in the conditions of the Decision.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES -- Since the previous EIR was certified or previous ND was adopted, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or "new information of substantial importance" that cause one or more effects to cultural resources including: causing a change in the significance of a historical or archaeological resource as defined in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5; destroying a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature; and/or disturbing any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

YES

☐

NO

☒

Based on an analysis of records and a survey of the property by staff archaeologist, Donna Beddow, it has been determined that there are no historical resources, archaeological resources, human remains, or unique geologic features within the project site. Therefore, there would be no impact to these resources.

However, a review of the County's Paleontological Resources Maps and data on San Diego County's geologic formations indicates that the project is located on geological formations that potentially contain unique paleontological resources. Excavating into undisturbed ground beneath the soil horizons may cause a significant impact if unique paleontological resources are encountered. Since an impact to paleontological resources does not typically occur until the resource is disturbed, monitoring during excavation is the essential measure to mitigate potentially significant impacts to unique paleontological resources to a level below significance.

The project has low potential for containing paleontological resources and will excavate the substratum and/or bedrock below the soil horizons.

A monitoring program implemented by the excavation/grading contractor will be required. Equipment operators and others involved in the excavation should watch for fossils during the normal course of their duties. In accordance with the Grading Ordinance, if a fossil or fossil assemblage of greater than twelve inches in any dimension is encountered during excavation, all excavation operations in the area where the fossil or fossil assemblage was found shall be suspended immediately, the County's Permit Compliance Coordinator shall be notified, and a Qualified Paleontologist shall be retained by the applicant to inspect the find to determine if it is significant. A Qualified Paleontologist is a person who has, to the satisfaction of the Planning & Development Services Director:

- A Ph.D. or M.S. or equivalent in paleontology or closely related field (e.g., sedimentary or stratigraphic geology, evolutionary biology, etc.);
- Demonstrated knowledge of southern California paleontology and geology; and
- Documented experience in professional paleontological procedures and techniques.

If the Qualified Paleontologist determines that the fossil or fossil assemblage is significant; a mitigation program involving salvage, cleaning, and curation of the fossil(s) and documentation shall be implemented. If no fossils or fossil assemblages of greater than 12 inches in any dimension are encountered during excavation, a "No Fossils Found" letter will be submitted to the County Planning & Development Services identifying who conducted the monitoring and that no fossils were found. If one or more fossils or fossil assemblages are found, the Qualified Paleontologist shall prepare a report documenting the mitigation program, including field and laboratory methodology, location and the geologic and stratigraphic setting, list(s) of collected fossils and their paleontological significance, descriptions of any analyses, conclusions, and references cited.

Therefore, with the implementation of the above project requirements during project grading operations, potential impacts to paleontological resources will be less than significant. Furthermore, the project will not result in a cumulative impact to paleontological resources because other projects that require grading in sensitive paleontological resource areas will be required to have the appropriate level of paleontological monitoring and resource recovery. In

addition, other projects that propose any amount of significant grading would be subject to the requirements for paleontological monitoring as required pursuant to the County's Grading Ordinance. Therefore, the project would not result in a significant direct, indirect, or cumulatively significant loss of paleontological resources.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS -- Since the previous EIR was certified or previous ND was adopted, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or "new information of substantial importance" that result in one or more effects from geology and soils including: exposure of people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving rupture of a known earthquake fault, seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction, strong seismic ground shaking, or landslides; result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil; produce unstable geological conditions that will result in adverse impacts resulting from landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse; being located on expansive soil creating substantial risks to life or property; and/or having soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?

YES
☐

NO
☒

VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS -- Since the previous EIR was certified or previous ND was adopted, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or "new information of substantial importance" that result in one or more effects related to environmental effects associated with greenhouse gas emissions or compliance with applicable plans, policies or regulations adopted for the purpose of reducing greenhouse gas emissions?

YES
☒

NO
☐

Since the previous Mitigated Negative Declaration was adopted, the State CEQA Guidelines were amended (March 2010) to require that the potential environmental effects of greenhouse gas emissions be addressed in CEQA documents.

In 2006, the State passed the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, commonly referred to as AB 32, which set the greenhouse gas emissions reduction goal for the State of California into law. The law requires that by 2020, State emissions must be reduced to 1990 levels by reducing greenhouse gas emissions from significant sources via regulation, market mechanisms, and other actions.

Senate Bill 375 (SB 375), passed in 2008, links transportation and land use planning with global warming. It requires the California Air Resources Board (ARB) to set regional targets for the purpose of reducing greenhouse gas emissions from passenger vehicles. Under this law, if regions develop integrated land use, housing and transportation plans that meet SB 375 targets, new projects in these regions can be relieved of certain review requirements under CEQA. Development of regional targets is underway and SANDAG is in the process of preparing the region's Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) which will be a new element of the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The strategy will identify how regional

greenhouse gas reduction targets, as established by the ARB, will be achieved through development patterns, transportation infrastructure investments, and/or transportation measures or policies that are determined to be feasible.

To implement State mandates to address climate change in local land use planning, local land use jurisdictions are generally preparing GHG emission inventories and reduction plans and incorporating climate change policies into local General Plans to ensure development is guided by a land use plan that reduces GHG emissions. The County of San Diego's General Plan, adopted in 2011, incorporates various climate change goals and policies. These policies provide direction for individual development projects to reduce GHG emissions and help the County meet its GHG emission reduction targets identified in the Climate Action Plan. The County is also in the process of developing a Climate Action Plan (CAP) and revising its Guidelines for Determining Significance.

The County continues to utilize an annual 900 metric ton carbon dioxide equivalent screening level, referenced by the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association as a conservative criterion, for determining the size of projects that would require further analysis and possibly specific design features or mitigation with regard to GHG emissions. The church expansion would result in an increase in mobile trips by 227 metric tons per year, which is below the 900 metric tons screening level used by The County of San Diego. Because it is not anticipated that project GHG emissions would exceed 900 metric tons, the modification would not have a significant cumulative contribution to climate change.

Therefore, no new environmental impacts associated with greenhouse gas emissions would occur and no revisions to the previous MND due to the involvement of significant new environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects is required.

VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS -- Since the previous EIR was certified or previous ND was adopted, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or "new information of substantial importance" that result in one or more effects from hazards and hazardous materials including: creation of a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, storage, use, or disposal of hazardous materials or wastes; creation of a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment; production of hazardous emissions or handling hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school; location on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 creating a hazard to the public or the environment; location within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport; within the vicinity of a private airstrip resulting in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area; impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan; and/or exposure of people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

YES

☐

NO

☒

Since the previous ND was adopted, there have been changes in the circumstances under which the project was undertaken related to Hazards. The project site is located within the declared Urban-Wildland Interface (UWI) area or a Hazardous Fire Area, and a Fire Protection Plan was prepared by the applicant and approved by the Fire Chief and PDS pursuant to Article 86, Section 8601 of the 2001 California Fire Code. The approved Fire Protection Plan details the adequacy of the water supply, proposed access, building ignition and fire resistance, fire protection systems and equipment, Fuel Modification Zones and vegetation management. The following project design measures will also be implemented as a part of the project: addition of three new fire hydrants, "no parking" signs along roadways measuring 24-feet in width or less, defensible space of 100-feet maintained around all structures, and the addition and maintenance of an approved landscape plan. Therefore, although there are changes in circumstances, these changes will not result in new significant environmental effects related to hazards.

IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY -- Since the previous EIR was certified or previous ND was adopted, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or "new information of substantial importance" that cause one or more effects to hydrology and water quality including: violation of any waste discharge requirements; an increase in any listed pollutant to an impaired water body listed under section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act ; cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses; substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level; substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area in a manner which would result in substantial erosion, siltation or flooding on- or off-site; create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems; provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; place housing or other structures which would impede or redirect flood flows within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map, including County Floodplain Maps; expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam; and/or inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

YES

☒

NO

☐

The project proposes an addition to an existing church with new buildings and parking areas, which requires National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permits for discharges of storm water associated with construction activities. The project applicant has provided a copy of A Major Stormwater Management Plan which demonstrates that the project will comply with all requirements of The NPDES Permit. The project site proposes and will be required to implement the following site design measures and/or source control BMPs and/or treatment control BMPs to reduce potential pollutants to the maximum extent practicable from entering storm water runoff: Bioretention Basins and all other Source Control BMPs described in the Major Stormwater

Management Plan. These measures will enable the project to meet waste discharge requirements as required by the Land-Use Planning for New Development and Redevelopment Component of the San Diego Municipal Permit (SDRWQCB Order No. R9-2007-0001), as implemented by the San Diego County Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Program (JURMP) and Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP).

In addition, the proposed project will not significantly alter established drainage patterns or significantly increase the amount of runoff for the following reasons, based on a Drainage Study prepared by REC Consultants on December 15, 2015:

- Drainage will be conveyed to either natural drainage channels or approved drainage facilities.
- The project will not increase water surface elevation in a watercourse with a watershed equal to or greater one square mile by 1 foot or more in height.
- The project will not increase surface runoff exiting the project site equal to or greater than one cubic foot/second.

Therefore, the project will not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site. Moreover, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable alteration or a drainage pattern or increase in the rate or amount of runoff, because the project will substantially increase water surface elevation or runoff exiting the site, as detailed above.

Finally, the project would have no impact on an impaired water body, it would not change the existing capacity of runoff water into storm drains, would not add a significant amount of additional sources of polluted runoff, it would not place structures within a flood area, and it would not impede or redirect flood flows.

X. LAND USE AND PLANNING -- Since the previous EIR was certified or previous ND was adopted, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or "new information of substantial importance" that cause one or more effects to land use and planning including: physically dividing an established community; and/or conflicts with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

YES
☐

NO
☒

XI. MINERAL RESOURCES -- Since the previous EIR was certified or previous ND was adopted, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or "new information of substantial importance" that cause one or more effects to mineral resources including: the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state; and/or loss of locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

YES
☐

NO
☒

XII. NOISE -- Since the previous EIR was certified or previous ND was adopted, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or "new information of substantial importance" that result in one or more effects from noise including: exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies; exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels; a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project; a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project; for projects located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, or for projects within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

YES
☐

NO
☒

The project is the expansion of an existing church. Existing facilities include a two-story hall and a two-story education building. The project modification would involve the construction of two additional educational structures and a sanctuary. The project would be subject to the County Noise Element which the land use categories of churches are subject to an interior noise level of 50 dBA. As part of the building design, noise measures such as (but not limited to) dual pane windows, construction materials, and door improvements may be need to conform to the 50 dBA requirement. The project would be conditioned to require an interior noise assessment to ensure conformance to this Noise Element requirement.

The project is zoned A70 and subject to the most restrictive nighttime one hour average 45 dBA sound level limit at the property line and 50 dBA daytime sound level limit. All noise sources associated with the project were assessed, comprised of outdoor church events, below ground wastewater treatment system, school activities, children playing, and mechanical unit. Both day and night source were assessed and demonstrated to comply with both the daytime and nighttime Noise Ordinance sound level requirements.

Construction noise was also assessed and would be subject to the 75 dBA eight hour sound level limit any occupied property line. Grading equipment would be spread-out over the project site from near distances to 400 feet away. Combined construction equipment operations would be more than 100 feet away from the adjacent property lines. Additionally, no blasting or rock

crushing is proposed during grading operations. Based on an average distance of over 100 feet, the grading activities would not exceed the 75 dBA requirement.

The proposed change would not be substantially more severe than what was assessed in the previous environmental. The changes described would not trigger the need to prepare a subsequent ND for noise. The project demonstrates Noise Ordinance compliance and Noise Element conformance.

XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING -- Since the previous EIR was certified or previous ND was adopted, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or "new information of substantial importance" that result in one or more effects to population and housing including displacing substantial numbers of existing housing or people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

YES

☐

NO

☒

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES -- Since the previous ND was adopted, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or "new information of substantial importance" that result in one or more substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities or the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the following public services: fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, or other public facilities?

YES

☐

NO

☒

XV. RECREATION -- Since the previous ND was adopted, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or "new information of substantial importance" that result in an increase in the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated; or that include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

YES

☐

NO

☒

XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC -- Since the previous EIR was certified or previous ND was adopted, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or "new information of substantial importance" that cause effects to transportation/traffic including: an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system; exceedance, either individually or cumulatively, of a

level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways; a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks; substantial increase in hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment); inadequate emergency access; inadequate parking capacity; and/or a conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?

YES
☒

NO
☐

A Traffic Impact Study, dated March 26, 2015, prepared by LOS Engineering was completed for the proposed project. The Traffic Impact Study identified that the proposed project would result in an additional 324 weekday and 1,301 Sunday ADT. The project trips would be distributed to Ash Street and SR-78. The traffic study found that the project would result in significant direct and cumulative impacts to Ash Street/SR-78 intersection, as well as an impact to a congestion management program (also SR-78). However, the mitigation measures will be required to reduce impacts to less than significant, which includes adding either a signalization or roundabout to the Ash Street/SR-78 intersection. With this mitigation, the project would not have a direct impact related to a conflict with policies establishing measures of the effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, and the project would not conflict with the applicable congestion management program because CMP impacts would be fully mitigated.

The proposed project generates 324 weekday and 1,301 Sunday ADT. These trips will be distributed on Mobility Element roadways in the County some of which currently or are projected to operate at inadequate levels of service. The County of San Diego has developed an overall programmatic solution that addresses existing and projected future road deficiencies in the unincorporated portion of San Diego County. The TIF program creates a mechanism to proportionally fund improvements to roadways necessary to mitigate potential cumulative impacts caused by traffic from future development. These new projects were based on SANDAG regional growth and land use forecasts, the SANDAG Regional Transportation Model was utilized to analyze projected build-out (year 2030) development conditions on the existing Mobility Element roadway network throughout the unincorporated area of the County. Based on the results of the traffic modeling, funding necessary to construct transportation facilities that will mitigate cumulative impacts from new development was identified. Existing roadway deficiencies will be corrected through improvement projects funded by other public funding sources, such as TransNet, gas tax, and grants. Potential cumulative impacts to the region's freeways have been addressed in SANDAG's Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). This plan, which considers freeway buildout over the next 30 years, will use funds from TransNet, State, and Federal funding to improve freeways to projected level of service objectives in the RTP.

These project trips therefore contribute to a potential significant cumulative impact and mitigation is required. The potential growth represented by this project was included in the growth projections upon which the TIF program is based. By ensuring TIF funds are spend for the specific roadway improvements identified in the TIF Program, the CEQA mitigation

requirement is satisfied and the Mitigation Fee nexus is met. Therefore, payment of the TIF, which will be required at issuance of building permits, in combination with other components of the program described above, will mitigate potential cumulative traffic impacts to less than significant.

Finally, the project would not add any incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment), would not increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections), and the project would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?

XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS -- Since the previous ND was adopted, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or "new information of substantial importance" that cause effects to utilities and service systems including: exceedance of wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board; require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities, new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects; require new or expanded entitlements to water supplies or new water resources to serve the project; result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments; be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs; and/or noncompliance with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

YES
☐

NO
☒

The project would discharge domestic waste to on-site wastewater systems (OSWS), also known as septic systems. Discharged wastewater must conform to the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) applicable standards, including the Regional Basin Plan and the California Water Code. California Water Code Section 13282 allows RWQCB to authorize a local public agency to issue permits for OSWS "to ensure that systems are adequately designed, located, sized, spaced, constructed and maintained." The RWQCB with jurisdiction over San Diego County have authorized the County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health (DEH) to issue certain OSWS permits through the County and within the incorporated cities. DEH has reviewed the OSWS layout for the project and approved the project's OSWS on September 17, 2015. Therefore, the project is consistent with the wastewater treatment requirements of the RWQCB as determined by the authorized, local public agency.

XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE: Since the previous ND was adopted, are there any changes in the project, changes in circumstances under which the project is undertaken and/or "new information of substantial importance" that result in any mandatory finding of significance listed below?

Does the project degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?

Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

YES
☒

NO
☐

Aesthetics – The effects of the church expansion in regards to aesthetics would be less than significant with mitigation of landscaping. This was discussed in the previous MND, however, the expansion could create more impacts to visual character, scenic highways, and daytime/nighttime views. The project was conditioned with design features to ensure the Modification to the Major Use Permit will not result in any adverse project or cumulative level effect to aesthetic resources.

Biology – The effects of the church expansion in regards to biology would be less than significant with mitigation. This was discussed in the previous MND, however, the expansion would create new impacts to non-native grassland. In order to mitigate for the impacts to non-native grassland, the applicant shall either purchase mitigation habitat credit or provide for the conservation of habitat of 0.3 acre of non-native grassland.

Traffic – The effects of the church expansion in regards to traffic would be less than significant with mitigation. This was discussed in the previous MND, however, the expansion would create new impacts to traffic. In order to reduce traffic impacts to less than significant, a condition is required to add either a signalization or roundabout to the Ash Street/SR-78 intersection. In addition, the project would be conditioned to enter into the Traffic Impact Fee (TIF) program.

Attachments

- Previous environmental documentation (including any previous addenda, Negative Declarations, or EIRs (including Supplemental of Subsequent EIRs)
- Extended Initial Studies

**XVIII. REFERENCES USED IN THE COMPLETION OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW
UPDATE CHECKLIST FORM**

Justin Rasas, LOS Engineering, Inc., Traffic Impact Study, March 26, 2015

Hedy Levine, REC Consultants, Inc., Fire Protection Plan, November 18, 2015

Donna Beddow, County of San Diego, Cultural Resources Survey Report – Negative Findings,
September 29, 2014

Elyssa Robertson, REC Consultants, Inc., Biological Resources Report, July 17, 2015

Larry Newcomb, NEHA Certified Sanitarian, Advanced Treatment System, May 25, 2015

Jeremy Loudon, LDN Consulting, Inc., Noise Study, October 21, 2015

Bruce A. Robertson, REC Consultants, Inc., Drainage/Hydrology Report, August 2015

Bruce A. Robertson, REC Consultants, Inc., SWQMP/HMP, March 13, 2017

California Department of Fish and Wildlife. Fish and Wildlife Code, Section 1600 *et. seq.*

California Environmental Quality Act, CEQA Guidelines

California Environmental Quality Act. 2001. California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Chapter 3,
Section 15382.

California Integrated Waste Management Board, Title 14, Natural Resources, Division 7

California Integrated Waste Management Board, Title 27, Environmental Protection, Division 2,
Solid Waste

California Public Resources Code, CPRC, Sections 40000-41956

County Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 3, Division 5, Chapter 3

County of San Diego Open Space Element of the General Plan Goal COS-17: Solid Waste
Management)

County of San Diego Open Space Element of the General Plan

County of San Diego Zoning Ordinance (Agricultural Use Regulation, Sections 2700-2720)

County of San Diego. Resource Protection Ordinance, Article II (16-17). October 10, 1991

County of San Diego. 1997. Multiple Species Conservation Program, County of San Diego
Biological Mitigation Ordinance

County of San Diego Watershed Protection, Stormwater Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance (WPO) (Ordinance Nos. 9424 and 9426, County Codes §§ 67801 et seq.)

Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection

Order No. 2001-01, NPDES No. CAS 0108758, California Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Diego Region

Ordinance 8334, An Ordinance to amend the San Diego County Code of Regulatory Ordinances relating to Flood Damage Prevention, Adopted by the Board of Supervisors on 12/7/93

Public Resources Code Sections 4290 and 4291

San Diego County Light Pollution Code (San Diego County Code Section 59.101)

The Importance of Imperviousness from *Watershed Protection Techniques* Vol. 1, No. 3 - Fall 1994 by Tom Schueler Center for Watershed Protection

The Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA), 1976

Uniform Fire Code, Article 9 and Appendix II-A, Section 16

Water Quality Control Plan for the San Diego Basin (9), California Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Diego Region